& Bartsch, 1909, is a synonym of *Odostomia (Evalea) raymondi* Dall & Bartsch, 1909. This second name was proposed for two specimens dredged off Catalina Island, California.

In small individuals of *Odostomia minutissima,* the aperture is rather oval and becomes rhombic in older, larger shells. In the holotype of *O. raymondi,* the aperture is broken but appears quite oval and DALL & BARTSCH (1909: 212) considered this a prime difference between the two nominal species. Actually, the holotype of *O. raymondi* has a poorly repaired break about one quarter volution before the aperture and secretion of the last quarter of the body whorl was, apparently, abnormal.

The type of *Odostomia raymondi* differs from representative *O. minutissima* in three characters that do not involve the aperture. The suture rises and falls in a pattern that resembles a sine wave while the suture of *O. minutissima* is a simple, incised line. In the type of *O. raymondi* the last three whorls have a tendency to balloon, becoming distinctly convex, while the whorls of *O. minutissima* are flat-sided. Finally, the holotype of *O. raymondi* is larger than any known *O. minutissima,* about 15% longer and comparably broader at 6 volutions.

Differences between the holotype of *Odostomia raymondi* and representative *O. minutissima* are not believed to be taxonomically significant. The retention of a juvenile character-like apertural shape, the ineffective repair of shell breakage, coiling irregularities, a ballooning of whorls, and large size are standard conchological manifestations of parasitism in gastropods (*e. g.*: ROTHSCHILD, 1936). The two nominal species seem identical in protoconch characters, in protoconch-teleoconch relationship, in all elements of sculpture, and in general growth form. Minor differences in size, in details of whorl profile, and in apertural shape seem to be normal individual variations in health. The two names are, thus, interpreted as synonyms. As the synonymy given below indicates, the name *Odostomia minutissima* Dall & Bartsch, 1909, is preoccupied and the name *Odostomia raymondi* Dall & Bartsch, 1909, should be used for this species.

Odostomia raymondi Dall & Bartsch, 1909

Not *Acteon minutissimus* MURDOCH, 1900: 316; plt. 20, fig. 5 [referred to *Odostomia* by all, or most, modern students of the New Zealand fauna (e. g. LAWS, 1940: 200)]

Odostomia (Evalea) minutissima Dall & Bartsch, 1909: 211; plt. 25, fig. 4

Odostomia (Evalea) raymondi DALL & BARTSCH, 1909: 212; plt. 25, fig. 9

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Travel expenses to examine the U. S. National Museum collection were partially paid by an Austin Peay State University Tower Fund research grant. Dr. Joseph Rosewater, U. S. National Museum, did much to facilitate this study.

Literature Cited

DALL, WILLIAM HEALEY & PAUL BARTSCH
1909. A monograph of West American pyramidellid mollusks. U. S. Nat. Mus. Bull. 68: xii+258 pp.; 30 plts. (13 December 1909)

JORDAN, ERIC KNIGHT
1926. Molluscan fauna of the Pleistocene of San Quentin Bay, Lower California. Proc. Calif. Acad. Sci. (4) 15 (7): 241 - 255; plt. 25; 1 text fig. (26 April 1926)

LAWS, CHARLES R.
1940. Review of the Tertiary and Recent Neozelanic pyramidellid molluscs. No. 6. The genus *Odostomia.* Trans. Roy. Soc. New Zealand 69: 191 - 209; plts. 16 - 18 (May 1940)

MURDOCH, R.
1900. Descriptions of some new species of Pliocene Mollusca from the Wanganui District, with notes on other described species. Trans. New Zealand Inst. 32: 216 - 221; plt. 20

ROTHSCHILD, MIRIAM
1936. Gigantism and variation in *Peringia ulvae* Pennant, 1777, caused by infection with larval trematodes. Journ. Mar. Biol. Assoc. (n. s.) 20: 537 - 546

Comments on Vokes' Paper

BY

MICHAEL D. HUBBARD

Department of Biological Science
Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306

THE RECENT PAPER by VOKES (1972) deserves comment as part implies an erroneous interpretation of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature and the rest may lead to subsequent confusion. While staying out of the taxonomic debate between Vokes and Cernohorsky I would like to discuss the conclusions of Vokes in her paper.

Quoting from Vokes "Article 20 states: 'If an existing genus-group name has been modified by substituting *-ites, -ytes* or *-ithes* for the original termination, the modified name if applied only to fossils is not available, except for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy' (*i. e.,* it would preoccupy a subsequently proposed genus of the same

name)." Nowhere in Article 20 or elsewhere in the Code is it stated that this name is identical to or a homonym of the name from which it is modified. Therefore *Murex* and *Muricites, Pecten* and *Pectinites,* etc., are not homonyms and should not be treated as such. Since *Murex* and *Muricites* are neither homonyms nor identical (on the basis of nomenclature), *Murex aculeatus* Lamarck, 1822, is not a homonym of *Muricites aculeatus* Schlotheim, 1820. The same applies to the other examples quoted by Vokes.

The problem of secondary homonymy is indeed a vexing one. Mayr (1969) mentions the concept of the "actuality principle" whereby there is a strong trend to sanction renaming only where two specific names are nominally congeneric (secondary homonyms in actuality) at the time of discovery of the potential homonymy. Thus if no confusion results from retaining the specific names, it seems provident not to change one if they are not congeneric at the time.

Literature Cited

Mayr, Ernst
1969. Principles of systematic zoology. New York (McGraw-Hill) xi+428 pp.; illust.
Vokes, Emily Hoskins
1972. Note on secondary homonymy. The Veliger 15 (2): 102 (1 October 1972)

(with additional comments by a referee and the editor)

REFEREE'S COMMENTS

The rationale for Article 20 of the International Code on Zoological Nomenclature, concerning genus-group names ending in *-ites,* must seem obscure to zoologists who have not had to deal with the paleontological literature of the early 19th century. There was even a proposal at the ICZN Colloquium in 1958 not to include it in the Code. However, when the matter was explained by paleontologists present, the provision was adopted.

In pre-Darwinian days, when the geologic time-scale was only just beginning to be set in order, relative ages of fossils (or "petrifactions," as they were usually called) could hardly even be guessed at. Workers tended to name their fossil finds in terms of modern genera, but to make clear that they were speaking of a petrifaction, not a modern specimen, they would use a special ending, derived from the Greek word for stone, "*lithos*" (λιθος), as an indication that this was a fossil member of the stated genus. A species would be cited as "*Pectinites x-us*" rather than as the more cumbersome "*Pecten x-us,* fossil specimen." In a list that would comprise both fossil and Recent forms, the generic name and the derived *-ites* names might be used interchangeably. In the 1940's paleontologists brought to the attention of the International Commission this peculiar usage, and a procedure for dealing with it was incorporated in the tentative code that was published in 1953 as the "Copenhagen Decisions." Later, in 1958, Professor J. C. Bradley compiled from this and the previous Rules a draft code that was used by the 1958 Colloquium. From this stems the official (1961) version of our present Code. In the Bradley draft, the intent is more clear-cut than it is in the final published version, for the committee charged with drawing up the wording of the final Code was also charged to condense, and in this case there was some loss of clarity. The Bradley draft, which was published in the Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature, vol. 14, part 1/6, 1957, reads (p. 57):

"**Forms of generic names intended for palaeontology --** If an established generic name is subsequently modified by changing its original termination to "*-ites,*" "*-ytes,*" or "*-ithes,*" whether preceded by a consonant or not, and if there is no clear evidence that this was done with any intent to establish a distinct genus (subgenus) and if an included species was based on a fossil, the modified form of the generic name shall have no status of availability, except that it shall enter into homonymy." There was a further explanation by Prof. Bradley: "Paleontologists have sometimes changed an established generic name in the manner indicated in order to signify that it was being used in reference to a fossil species."

Thus, under the Code the "*-ites*" names would in one sense be comparable to an incorrect subsequent spelling, without nomenclatural status but remaining nomenclaturally equivalent to the original generic name from which derived. However, because they are categorized as entering into homonymy (Article 56-b), they would preempt use of such a combination of letters for a generic name later proposed. In effect, when reading an old paleontological list, one would read "*Pecten*" for "*Pectinites,*" but no one can now validly propose as a new generic name *Pectinites.*

EDITOR'S COMMENTS

We cannot see that any useful purpose would be served if this debate about secondary homonymy were carried on further in "The Veliger." It would appear to us that it might be desirable for the various protagonists to enter into direct personal correspondence and, if and when they come to a complete agreement, to petition the International Commission to reword the pertinent provisions of the Code in a less ambiguous way. It is true that some provisions of the Code are open to different interpretations; this probably is intentional because of the assumption that different circumstances may require different approaches and that taxonomists would use their best judgment when applying the "Rules" and "Recommendations."